



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

### Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

### About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

Formation Path -

1982- 370



600042290N

33.

370.



600042290N

33.

370.

**THE KING AND THE CHURCH**  
**VINDICATED AND DELIVERED ;**  
**OR,**  
**THE PRIME MINISTER**  
**CONVICTED**  
**OF**  
**COUNSELLING TO THE CROWN,**  
**A VIOLATION OF THE CORONATION OATH :**  
**IN**  
**AN ADDRESS TO THE HOUSE OF LORDS,**  
**AND IN A**  
**PLAIN, SOLEMN, AND FAITHFUL APPEAL**  
**TO HIS GRACE THE**  
**LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.**

---

**BY**  
**A MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.**

---

**"Be wise now, therefore, O ye Kings : be instructed ye Judges of the Earth."—**  
**PSALM ii. 10.**

**LONDON :**  
**HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY :**  
**AND R. M. TIMS, GRAFTON-STREET, DUBLIN.**

**M.DCCC.XXXIII.**

370.

THE KING AND THE CHURCH

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

THE PRIME MINISTER

CONSTITUTION

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY



CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

CONSTITUTIONAL HISTORY

## AN ADDRESS,

&c. &c.

---

MY LORDS,

HAD the exercise of ministerial power been confined to the subversion merely of the political Institutions of the Empire, however dark and disastrous the results had been, to all that men hold dear in civil and in social life, still it would seem right that the opposition—the exposure, or if it might so please Providence, the frustration of such measures, had been made by men placed in the sphere of public life and called to this legitimate discharge of public duty. Political delinquency, however criminal, had not seemed to call for the interference of the Ministers of religion; and although in common with all men of principle, they had deprecated the evil, it had not devolved on them to undertake the task of its exposure.

But now, my Lords, the Minister has overstepped the limits which have hitherto served as the ordinary boundary of political ambition—he has not only revolutionized the Government, but he has invaded the Established Church of our country—he has not

only triumphed over all the principles of her Constitution, but he now comes forward to trample on the Ministers, the Dignitaries, and to confiscate the property of her religion. Whether he is to be permitted to do so, remains entirely with your Lordships—but if he could effect his purpose, my Lords, then we could only say, that principle and truth were vanished from Great Britain—she might retain the name, but she should have lost the character of a Christian nation. If religion is to be violated in the very last and purest sanctuary, to which she could have fled for refuge, then, whatever disasters can fall upon the land, we shall appear to have justly entailed them on our head—we shall be exhibited as ripe and ready for the judgments of our God; and the man who is the instrument of such a crime, shall appear to have been raised up by Providence, like him who was set on high in Egypt of old, for the ruin of his country, and to make her an example and a warning to the world.

It is not for me, my Lords, to enter into any review of the political conduct of the Prime Minister, nor to advert to any of the cureless evils he has inflicted on his own unhappy country—I would confine myself to this one measure, with which he threatens the Established Church in Ireland, and address myself to the principle, the truth, the justice, and the religion of the Peers of the United Empire.

I shall not, my Lords, arraign the motives of the noble Premier, I shall but speak of the direct and necessary tendency and end of his government, or rather his misgovernment of Ireland; and I affirm that there is not an honest Protestant, nor an honest Roman Catholic in the country, who does not anticipate, that the result, if not the object of his administration, is to set up Popery here, on the ruins of the Established religion. What, my Lords, are the facts of the case?—Let us ask—In what may the support of a religion be said to consist? We may answer, in the protection of the *principles*, the *rights*, the *properties*, and the *lives* of those who profess it; then let us try the government of the noble Premier by this test, as to the Protestant religion in Ireland.



What protection, my Lords, has he given to its *principles*? It has ever been the boast of the Protestant Established Church that the very foundation of her existence—the basis and superstructure of her faith, has been the pure and sacred Word of Everlasting Life—this she has held up as the beacon and bulwark of salvation for the human soul. What then has he done, my Lords? The first use he has made of his power—the first effort he has put forth of his official authority, has been to strike a blow at the very root of the Christian religion—he has withdrawn from the instruction of Ireland the Word of the Eternal God—he has impannelled a jury to sit in judgment on the Bible—to give in a verdict against every passage in that Holy Book that could enlighten the superstition, that could reform the idolatry, that could instruct the ignorance of this miserable and benighted country—he has permitted them to expunge these passages from the Book of God, and then he has withdrawn the public money from Scriptural education, and given it to propagate their abominable perversion of the Bible, as the instrument of instruction for the rising generation of Ireland. This system he has endeavoured to maintain—he has ventured to stand up in the presence of your Lordships to vindicate and to defend it—and while his plea was, that it was for the purpose of promoting a united education, that plea was urged in the face of unanswerable fact; viz.—that the whole body of Protestants in Ireland, Bishops, Clergy, and Laity, rise as one man to oppose such an unprincipled system. If to sacrifice, to mutilate, and to supplant the Word of the Living God as a means of the education of the country, if this is to protect the principles of the Protestant religion, then has the Noble Premier protected those principles, my Lords. It is but a few days ago, that a Roman Catholic priest, in Carlow, in vindicating his government, is reported to have used this remarkable expression—“they have taken away £30,000 a year from the Kildare-place Society, and have given it to the Roman Catholic priests of Ireland!!”

I must pause here for a moment, and entreat your Lordships to

consider this view of the case. Often and often in the walls of that Senate house, your Lordships have called the God of Heaven to witness, that you believed the religion of Roman Catholics to be idolatrous and superstitious. Is it then, my Lords, a proper or a Christian use of the power with which that God entrusts a British Peer, and for which, alas ! too soon a fearful account is to be rendered at His bar—to take the Holy Word on which he has sworn, that the religion of this unhappy people was idolatrous and superstitious, and to withdraw it from the education of their children—to employ a body of men to mutilate that Word, to suit their idolatry and superstition, and then to tax the country, to propagate this iniquitous perversion of principle, and of religion ? Since it is not possible to suppose that there could be any such individual who would mock that Holy Word, and its Divine Author, by swearing what he knew not to be true—Is it not worse than mockery, my Lords, to sacrifice that Holy Word, to minister to the errors of that very religion which he knew, and swore to be false ? And is it going beyond the strictest limits of acknowledged truth to state, that in sacrificing the Bible to popery, the Prime Minister, as far as in him lay, instead of protecting, has sacrificed the best, the dearest, most vital interests, and the fundamental principles of the Protestant Religion ?

Let me now entreat your Lordships, to consider, how far he has administered the Laws, to protect the rights, the properties, and the lives of the Protestants of Ireland. Facts must determine.—It is, I believe, an admitted fact, that under the express instigation of Popish bishops, priests, and demagogues, a systematic war has been proclaimed against the property of the Clergy of the Established Church. What now, my Lords, has been done in the government of this Country ? Is it, my Lords, a due administration of justice, and of law, to afford protection to crime, and to inflict punishment on virtue ?—Who, my Lords, have been made the subjects of a most unprecedented rigorous prosecution ? The men who stood forward at the peril of their lives, to vindicate, and to assert the authority of the laws. Who

have been held up as the objects of pity and protection?—The relatives of those who had unhappily fallen in their violation. The very men who were the legally appointed guardians of the peace of the country, when set upon, by armed mobs, in the execution of their duty—when their lives were in jeopardy—when the pitchfork and pike were at their throats, have been constrained to hesitate, whether they should exercise the first right of human nature—whether they should allow themselves to perish by the weapons of the assassins, or defend themselves, and risk the prosecution of the government. The greatest criminal in the country, the demagogue, who has been the primary agent in its agitation, has been made, at one moment, the subject of the mockery of a legal prosecution, at another, the object of indecent and dishonourable promotion?—What, my Lords, has been the actual result of this disastrous administration? Thousands, and tens of thousands of Protestants, the only friends of British law—the only firm supporters of British connection—the only bond of union, between the countries, have been forced to sell their farms, their leases, and their all, and seek, in exile, on a foreign shore, that security, for life and property, which they were denied in this—their Clergy have been, in many places, all reduced to poverty—many driven into banishment, and several given up to assassination—Rectors forced to fly, and indebted to alms for subsistence—Curates dismissed, for want of support—Churches shut up—the crimes of the night have outstripped the records of the day—Counties in a state more fearful than that of open insurrection—Witnesses appalled—Juries intimidated even to perjury, to acquit, in the very teeth of unimpeached and doubtless evidence—Prisons filled, and as rapidly emptied of their inmates, turned loose again unpunished on the land, to steep their hands once more in plunder, and in blood—till all the powers of the Executive, like those of a body diseased, and impotent from inertia, had sunk into paralysis—Law, but an empty name—Government, but a bye-word—the Authority that ought to have been the respected Guardian of the country, the scorn of the bad, the pity of the

good, and the alternate object of derision and execration to the nation. This melancholy detail, my Lords, your Lordships know to be a matter of history. It is recorded in the annals of your Right Honorable house, when the Noble Premier himself, has been compelled to detail to your Lordships, the miseries of Ireland, when having awakened to a sense of the danger of the country—having felt the conscious incapacity of a paralyzed executive authority, he has come to Parliament to seek a remedy for its weakness, in a most unheard-of stretch of legislative power; and having left this miserable country, to suffer and to sink, without the protection of the laws, to remedy the woes he has occasioned, he has made it appear to your Lordships wisdom, that it was necessary to place it without the pale of the constitution.

Here, my Lords, let me entreat your Lordships to consider whether it be consistent with the dignity of Justice, or with the principles of truth, when driven by necessity to impose some restraint on crime, that a man should purchase popularity from vice, at the price of the Institutions that are the only outward guardians of religion and of virtue. Is it just, my Lords, to propitiate the plunderer by the sacrifice of the property that is the object of his rapine—to throw a sop to silence the clamours of seditious superstition, by surrendering half the government, half the safeguards, half the episcopal property, and half the authority and position of the Established Religion in Ireland?

What, my Lords, has been the plan of the noble Premier?—He has come, at the same moment, with two Bills in his hand, into the Senate; by one he demands the authority of a Dictator over our liberties—by the other he claims the power of an Inquisitor over our religion: and what is the clear, ostensible, undeniable object in this—an object so recognised by Mr. O'Connell, that he considered the passing of the Church Bill might supersede the necessity of the Coercion Bill?—That object is, my Lords, so to gratify Roman Catholics by the invasion of the Protestant religion, as to heal the wound inflicted by the suppression of Popish sedition, plunder and assassination—that the popularity of the one measure

may counterbalance the odium of the other. In the one, a necessary but reluctant punishment is inflicted on vice, but in the other, its displeasure is propitiated by the voluntary and gratuitous sacrifice of virtue.

Nor is this object more distinctly developed by the nature of this bill, than by the mode of its enactment. The necessities of the country, the rapid increase of crime, demanded the promptitude of legislative and executive authority to meet it—and what has the noble Premier done, my Lords? He has endeavoured to bring the Bill for the spoliation of the Protestant Church, “*pari passu*” through the House, with the Bill for the suppression of Popish crime. It has been pressed on with a recklessness of precipitation, an indecency of haste, unprecedented in the annals of calm, of dignified, of statesmanlike legislation; and the scheme was only frustrated by the blunder of the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

Let me earnestly entreat your Lordships simply to consider the fact. Here is one Bill for the suppression of the most atrocious series of crimes, of plunder and assassination, that ever disgraced the annals of a civilized country.—Here is another Bill, in which are involved the feelings, the principles, the properties, of men who are the objects of these crimes; men, who, whatever be their errors, their infirmities, their sins, are not only legally innocent, but are the best and brightest ornaments of their country;—this Bill, by which the discipline of their Church is to be totally subverted—the half of their Bishops annihilated—their Sees confiscated—their whole remaining property iniquitously taxed—the most ancient bulwarks of their Established Religion broken down and trampled in the dust;—this Bill, which, if it were useful, or even necessary, would require, from the complexity of the interests which it involves, the deepest consideration, the most prudent care and circumspection, to frame, to prepare, before it could be even submitted to the Senate—this Bill is to be hurried, precipitated, unweighed, undigested, and almost totally unconsidered, through the Parliament—for what?.....that it may prove

a healing measure—a soothing balm—a propitiatory sacrifice—to counterbalance, to mollify the severity of an enactment, that is to repress the atrocities and crimes of the knaves, the robbers, the traitors, the assassins of the country!!!

Are these, my Lords, the principles of Christianity? Is this, my Lords, the legislation of a Statesman? I have thought over all the annals of British history, but such another specimen, of the Constitution violated beyond all precedent, to punish and repress crime, and the very best and holiest Institutions of the country sacrificed at the same moment, to gain the favour, or to sooth the indignation of the criminals who were to be punished—such another specimen of a practical confusion of all good and evil—such a compromise of principle between the Statesman and the Robber—the Christian and the Infidel—the Vindicator of virtue, and the Votary of vice—I humbly confess I have been unable to discover, in all the history of the British Empire.

But the worst feature in the case is, the effort to cover the design beneath the guise and semblance of benefitting the Church! What evil, my Lords, has been remedied? what abuse has been corrected? what interest of religion has been advanced, by this iniquitous and abominable Bill? Are the Bishops so energetic, that it is necessary to put a drag on their exertions, by giving them more than any honest man could undertake to do? Have they only half enough of power, that it is useful to double their patronage? or twice too much zeal that it is beneficial to diminish half their number? Are the Clergy so numerous in proportion to the wants of the people, that it is just, to lay such a tax on the Rectors, as to disable multitudes of them from keeping a Curate? or are the Curates so amply paid, that while the property of the Church is confiscated, to pay parochial cess, which, your Lordships well know, will not relieve the poor of that burthen, but go into the pockets of the Protestant Landlords, this bill has not made provision to appropriate a single shilling to increase the income of men of learning, and gentlemen who are barely existing, with their families, on £75 per annum. In short, my Lords, let the

noble Premier point out one single benefit to Religion, or to the Church, comprehended in the scope of his Bill, out of all the numerous improvements which might be made, and then he shall have credit for intending to benefit the Church.

But without touching on its details, is it not monstrous, my Lords, to tell us, that this measure is for the advantage of the Protestant Religion, when the greatest enemy of that religion, unable to contain his delight, started from his seat the moment it was announced, and declared he could not repress the satisfaction he felt at the enactment? Is it not monstrous to tell the Nation, that that measure could promote the interest of the Protestant Church, the very announcement of which was hailed with cheers by Mr. O'Connell, and by all the Popish Demagogues in the House of Commons? Are we to admit that it can benefit the Church, at the expense of our understanding? Or, knowing that it must tend to its ruin, (and who that knows the truth could be ignorant of it?) can we endure it without an abandonment of our principles?

But let me now call your Lordships most grave consideration to the profanity of an attempt, to strengthen the hands of Popery, and to weaken and undermine the Protestant Religion in Ireland. Let me ask, my Lords, is it possible that a man of rank, of information, of talents—a Prime Minister of England, in the nineteenth century—a man whose mind has not been blinded by the bigotry and ignorance of a superstitious education, can believe that his fellow mortal, a poor weak sinner like himself, is able, by pronouncing a few cabalistic words over a bit of paste, made of flour and water, to convert that thing into the Creator of the heavens and earth, whose whole essence, “Body, Blood, Soul, and Divinity,” is thenceforth contained in the compass of that Wafer—which man is therefore to worship and to adore as his Creator, Preserver, and Redeemer? Is it possible, my Lords, he can believe, that man is not only to adore this idolatrous thing, but believe that it is to take away his sins before God? Can he in his conscience or understanding, call the worship and

adoration of this thing, Christianity? Can he say, not only, that man ought to pay the worship due to God, to this thing, but the homage due to Him, to the men who profess to perform this apotheosis of a bit of paste? If not—if his understanding and conscience revolt from this wretched idolatry, then, how can he reconcile it to either of them, to use the power with which Providence has entrusted him, to promote, as far as he can, the propagation of this criminal idolatrous system, and to undermine and subvert the Protestant Established Church, the only bulwark against it in this miserable country?—for this, to lift his arm against the Word of the living God—for this, as it shall soon appear, to counsel a Crime to the conscience of his King? Does he act thus in reference to Eternity? Alas! how shall any man render a reason at the bar of God, for employing a set of men to mutilate his Word, to accommodate the guilt of that, which his common sense must pronounce, yea, which he has often sworn to be an Idolatrous Superstition? Does he act so for the temporal benefit of the country? Alas! blind and infatuated man, look I beseech you, my Lords, at Ireland. Your Lordships see its wretched population steeped in ignorance and crime—you see the poor unhappy people moved as a machine under the power and influence of the Ministers of this Superstition—you see them led to violate not only all the laws of civil and social life, but even those that ordinarily sway mankind against all other principles, the ties of self interest—forced under the beck of their Priests, against the wishes and feelings of their Landlords—driven on by them (for every one knows that Dr. Doyle and the Priests are the whole movers of this Prædial Insurrection) to resist the Laws, to plunder, and to assassinate the Clergy, till even the Prime Minister is compelled to have recourse to this outrage on the Constitution, to repress their crimes. Yet, in defiance of all the evidence of fact, and common sense—of all the difficulties with which he is surrounded, and of all the calamities in which the country is involved, by this wretched superstition—the noble Premier is using his power to suppress the Word of God—coun-



selling a breach of his Coronation Oath to the King—committing the utmost violence on the Established Religion of the country, and trying to weaken its influence, nay, to subvert its existence—for what?—to give increasing power, and permanent stability to the source of all these evils, and the cause of all those crimes—to that, which all history and all experience prove to have been the curse and ruin of the country!!! O! my Lords, what language can do justice to the folly of such conduct in a Statesman? What can sufficiently express its criminality in a man who calls himself by the name of a Christian?

I pass on, my Lords, from considering the profanity of this attempt, to examine it in a legal and constitutional point of view, and this is necessarily introductory to a subject the most solemn that can be submitted to your Lordships' consideration—the breach of the Coronation Oath involved in this bill. For the Coronation Oath of the King, referring to the Law of the Land, and being the solemn compact, wherewith he is bound to his People, it is necessary to consider how far the Law obliges the Sovereign to protect the Church, before we pronounce on this act as a breach of that obligation.

Here, my Lords, no light and trivial charge is laid before your Lordships' judgment—these are no imputations of an ephemeral pamphleteer—The annals of England afford no similar testimony against the conduct of a Prime Minister. The Noble Premier is charged with counselling an act of Perjury to the Crown, in the solemn judgment of thirteen Bishops, who have felt it their duty to deliver their grave and deliberate opinion on this subject. Eight dioceses have included in their objections to this Bill, their united judgment, that it is a violation of the Coronation Oath; while some of the Bishops, and a body of Deans, Archdeacons, and Clergy, amounting already to more than five hundred both in England and Ireland, having given their opinion as to other evils of this measure in other petitions and addresses, have taken up this one position; and in an Address, which they have felt it their duty to lay at the feet of their gracious Sove-

reign, have given to this single point its prominent and substantive station and importance, namely—that the Prime Minister of England, if he advises the Royal Assent to that Bill, *shall incur the guilt of counselling the King to violate his Coronation Oath*. So that this charge, my Lords, is supported by the grave and solemn judgment of thirteen Bishops, eight Dioceses, and a distinct body of Bishops, Deans, Archdeacons, and Clergy of Ireland and England, amounting to above five hundred individuals.

It now remains that your Lordships should examine, whether the opinions of these personages have been lightly and unjustly taken up—and the Church of Ireland feels confident, that your Lordships will bestow upon the subject, all that deep and solemn consideration which its importance deserves, and which religion ought to expect from the wisdom, the dignity, the justice, and the religion of the Spiritual and Temporal Peers of the British Empire.

The case, my Lords, divides itself into two distinct questions :—

1st.—What security do the Laws of England provide for the maintenance and property of the Established Church ?

2dly.—What obligation does the Coronation Oath impose upon the King to maintain those Laws ?

Without entering into the original grants of property to the Church, it is as clear as any fact of history, or any principle of British Law, that that property is held by a right as indefeasible as any tenure in the Empire.

Let us hear what Judge Blackstone says upon this subject.

“ William the Conqueror thought proper to change the spiritual tenure of frank-almoign, or free alms, under which the bishops held their lands during the Saxon Government, into the feudal or Norman tenure by barony, which subjected their estates to all civil charges and assessments, from which they were before exempt—and in right of succession to these baronies, which were unalienable from their respective dignities, the Bishops and Abbots were allowed their seats in the House of Lords.”—BLACKSTONE, B. 1. C. 2.

Now, from this it is clear, my Lords, that the Episcopal

Estates were held under the Saxon Government, (as they were even from Ethelwolf,) that though William the Conqueror made a change in the nature of their tenure, that tenure was then considered "*unalienable from their respective dignities.*"

Let me ask your Lordships now to consider whether any subsequent law has abrogated this tenure, and laid them open to the unprincipled confiscation which this Bill proposes.

Blackstone, speaking of the sources of the King's Revenue, mentions, as the first, "The custody of the temporalities of Bishops, by which are meant all the lay revenues, lands and tenements (in which is included his barony,) which belong to an Archbishop's or Bishop's See—and these upon the vacancy of the bishoprick are immediately the right of the King, as a consequence of his prerogative in Church matters, whereby he is considered as the founder of all Archbishopricks and Bishopricks to whom, during the vacancy, they revert. \* \* \*

Another reason may also be given why the policy of the law hath vested this custody in the King—because, as the successor is not known, the lands and possessions of the See would be liable to spoil and devastation, if no one had a property therein.

"Therefore, the law has given to the *King, not the temporalities themselves, but the custody of the temporalities, till such time as a successor is appointed, with power of taking to himself all the intermediate profits without any account of the successor, and with the right of presenting (which the Crown very frequently exercises,) to such benefices and other preferments as fall within the time of vacation.*"

He then goes on to state how the ancient Kings, and especially William Rufus, used to keep the Bishopricks a long time vacant, for the sake of enjoying the temporalities—that they committed waste on the woods and other parts of the estate—that they would, even when the See was filled up, not restore the Bishop his temporalities unless he purchased them at an exorbitant price.—That, "to remedy this, King Henry the First granted a charter at the beginning of his reign, promising neither to sell, nor let

“to farm, nor take any thing from the domains of the Church, till the successor was installed. And it was made one of the articles of the great Charter, that *no waste should be committed on the temporalities of Bishopricks, neither should the custody of them be sold.* The same is ordained by the Statute of Westminster the First; and the Statute of 14 Edward III. st. 4. c. 4. is still more explicit in prohibiting the other exactions.”

He then goes on to state that, “This revenue of the King, which was formerly very considerable, is now by a customary indulgence, almost reduced to nothing; for at present, as soon as the new Bishop is consecrated and confirmed, he usually receives the restitution of his temporalities, quite entire and untouched, from the King, &c.”—BLACKSTONE, Book I. C. 8.

Now, my Lords, on this authority of Sir Wm. Blackstone, I lay down these principles as the Law of the Land, which has been only progressively strengthened by successive Legislative Enactments, from the days of William the Conqueror, till the accession of William the Fourth.

1st.—That the temporalities of the Bishopricks are, and have been vested, by Law, solely in the King, as the supreme ecclesiastical authority, totally without the jurisdiction, and beyond the reach or interference of the other branches of the Legislature.

2d.—That they are so vested in the King, not for his own use, nor to be within his own power, nor to be used at his discretion, except in the choice of the persons on whom he bestows them, as he has no right either to alienate, sell, let to farm, or in any way injure them—but he holds them solely as a Trustee, for the Bishops of the Church, to whom he is bound by the Law, to restore them, saving the intermediate profits of the time of vacancy, and now, by recent usage, even those, whole and undiminished.

3d.—That, whatever be the security which the principles of Equity, the Law, or the ancient usages of England afford, for the discharge of any solemn trust, that security is given by Equity, by the Law, and the ancient usages of England, for the discharge of

this solemn trust of the temporalities of the Bishops, so vested in the King, to be preserved for their use, as Bishops of the Established Religion.

4th.—That over and above all other security which the Law affords, for the preservation of this trust, and the protection of this property, there is superadded the solemn sanction of the King's Coronation Oath. We shall now proceed to examine what is the obligation which this Oath imposes, according to the construction put upon it by Sir William Blackstone.

And first, my Lords, I will observe, that this able Lawyer carefully sets forth, in his disquisitions on this important subject, how the true principles of sound Religion are necessarily identified with the sacred rights of faithful Government. He had no idea, my Lords, that the Eternal Principles of Divine Truth were to be made subservient to the purposes, of contemptible Political Expediency. He did not anticipate that day of gloom and guilt for his country, when the Mitre and the Bible were to be made the Toys of a Prime Minister—when the Plunder of the Church, and the assassination of the Clergy, by an infatuated Popish mob, was to be made the pretext to burst the ties of Law, and Justice, and Religion—to confiscate one half of the Sees, and put down one half of the Bishops of the Established Religion—when ministers of the Established Church were to be sought for, who would sit down with Popish Jesuits to mangle the Bible for the uses of superstition—and, when the King was to be counselled to violate his compact with his people, and advised to recommend the mutilation of the Word of God, and the criminal invasion of the Protestant Religion, to secure the aid, and court the popularity, of Popish Priests and Demagogues, for the Minister. Blackstone never anticipated such iniquity in a Minister, as to dare, nor such degeneracy in the Nation, as to suffer crimes like these; and therefore, he speaks like a Statesman and a Christian, in the Chapter which he writes—

## ON THE KING'S DUTIES.

Let me intreat your Lordships, to mark the principles he lays down.

In speaking of the reciprocal duties between the Monarch and his subjects, he says—

“ These reciprocal duties are what I apprehend were meant by the Convention of 1688, when they declared King James had broken the original compact between King and People. But, however, as the terms of that original contract were in some degree disputed, being alleged to exist principally in theory, and to be only deducible by reason and the rules of natural law, in which deduction different understandings might very considerably differ, it was, after the Revolution, *judged proper to declare these duties expressly, and to reduce that contract to a plain certainty*; so that whatever doubts might be formerly raised by weak and scrupulous minds, about the existence of such an original contract, *they must now entirely cease*, especially with regard to every Prince who has reigned since 1688.”

Permit me now, my Lords, to submit to your Lordship's wisdom, whether you think that the Convention of 1688 was so ignorant of Religion, of Law, of the English language, and of all common sense, that though they expended all their wisdom to “ *declare these duties expressly, and to reduce this contract to a plain certainty*; yet they so completely failed to make themselves intelligible, even to the best and wisest men, that the Bishops and Clergy of Ireland, who have so solemnly expressed their sentiments on the subject, must be in error, when they pronounce this Bill a violation both of the spirit and letter of that contract? My Lords, the noble Premier is at issue not only with the Bishops and Clergy of Ireland, and the Coronation Oath of the King, but with the united wisdom, and with all the character of the Convention of 1688, and with the decision which the very first authority on British Law has pronounced, respecting their objects and intentions in settling the Religion and Government of their country. Again, my Lords—Sir William Blackstone corroborates the

principles which he advances by quotations from two writers, and from the Statute Law, and it is enough to say of their authority, that this able Lawyer quotes it—He says:

“The principal duty of the King, is to govern his people according to Law.”

“The King,” saith Bracton, who wrote under Henry III. “ought not to be subject to man, but to God, and to the Law, for the Law maketh the King. Let the King, therefore, render to the Law, what the Law has invested in him with regard to others—dominion and power—for he is not truly King, whose will and pleasure reigns, and not the Law.”

And again—“the King also hath a Superior—namely, God; and also the Law, by which he was made a King.”

Thus Bracton. And Fortescue also lays it down as a principle, “that the King of England must rule his people according to the decrees of the Laws thereof, insomuch, that he is bound by an Oath in his Coronation, to the observance and keeping of his own Laws. But to obviate all doubts and difficulties, concerning this matter, it is expressly declared, by Statute 12, and 13, William III. c. 2, ‘that, the Laws of England are the birth-right of the people thereof, and all the Kings and Queens who shall ascend the throne of this realm, ought to administer the government of the same, according to the said Laws, and all their officers and ministers, ought to serve them respectively according to the same, and therefore, all the Laws and Statutes of this realm, for securing the Established Religion, and the rights and liberties of the people thereof, and all other Laws and Statutes of the same, now in force, are ratified and confirmed accordingly.’—Blackstone, B. I. c. 6.

Now, my Lords, I submit these quotations for the purpose of establishing these principles.

That, since it is as clear as the light of day, that the Laws of England, since and antecedent to the Conquest, renewed and ratified by every Statute of the realm, from the Charter of Henry I. to the Convention of 1688, and from that to the accession of

his present Majesty, have vested the guardianship of the temporalities and spiritual rights of the Bishops and Clergy, in the Crown as a Trustee, for their especial use, as their indubitable and prescriptive right—And since, by the very tenure on which the Monarch holds his Crown, he stands bound by every obligation, human and divine, responsibility to his country, and his God, to administer with all fidelity, that sacred Trust, which “*all the Laws and Statutes of this realm for securing the Established Religion,*” “*so ratified and confirmed,*” repose in him—and since it was the aim and object of the united wisdom of the Legislature, at that Revolution, when the Protestant Religion was established, to reduce into the clearest and most intelligible form, so that it might never after be liable to misapprehension, the contract between the Monarch and his people, for the ratification of his maintenance of that religion, and those laws by which it was established, which contract is expressed in the clear and explicit terms of the Coronation Oath—I most respectfully, most reluctantly, but most solemnly assert, that in counselling his Royal Master to deprive the Church of ten of her Bishops—to confiscate ten of their Sees from her Episcopacy—to tax the Clergy by an unjust and oppressive impost—to supersede Episcopal authority over their Unions and Parishes, by a Commission, of which the majority are laymen, and thereby, instead of preserving, to deprive the Bishops and Clergy of their Rights. The Prime Minister is guilty of the crime of counselling his Royal Master to break his solemn contract with his people, to which he stands pledged in his Coronation Oath—to violate his most sacred obligations, as a Christian, to his Religion—as a King, to his Country—and as a Subject, to his God.

I feel, my Lords, I am addressing the most august assembly of Statesmen in the world, who know the statutes of their country, and who can try the validity of this assertion.

Let me now entreat your Lordships to consider the words of the Coronation Oath, and your Lordships shall perceive that this is the very “*Explicit Contract,*” on which Blackstone states, that



the wisdom of the Legislature of 1688, was expended, "*to reduce it to a plain certainty,*" and that all doubts of weak and scrupulous minds about it, "*must now entirely cease ;*" and your Lordships shall see in what this contract, which Blackstone considers reduced to such a "**PLAIN CERTAINTY,**" consists. He proceeds—

"As to the *terms of the original contract between King and People, these I apprehend to be now couched in the Coronation Oath*, which, by the statute 1, Wm. & M. is to be administered "to every King and Queen who shall succeed to the Imperial Crown of these Realms, by one of the Archbishops or Bishops of the Realm, in the presence of all the people, who on their parts do reciprocally take the Oath of Allegiance to the Crown."

Then he recites the Coronation Oath—then adds—

"This is the form of the Coronation Oath, as it is now prescribed by our laws, the principal articles of which, appear to be at least as ancient as the Mirror of justices, and even as the time of Bracton ; but *the wording of it was changed at the Revolution*, because (as the statute alleges) the Oath itself had been framed in *doubtful words and expressions*, with relation to ancient laws and constitutions, at this time unknown. However, in what form soever it be conceived, this is *most indisputably a fundamental and original express contract.*" Again—

"In the King's part of this original contract, are expressed all the duties that a Monarch can owe to his people—viz. *to govern according to Law—to execute judgment in mercy, and to maintain the Established Religion—and with respect to the latter of these three branches, we may further remark, that by the Act of Union, 5 Anne, c. 8, two preceding statutes are cited and confirmed*—the one of the Parliament of Scotland—the other of the Parliament of England ; which enact—the former, that every King, at his accession, shall take and subscribe an Oath, to preserve the Protestant Religion, and Presbyterian Church Government, in Scotland—the latter, that at his Coronation he shall take and subscribe a similar Oath

"to preserve the settlement of the Church of England, within England, Ireland, Wales, and Berwick, and the territories thereunto belonging."—Blackstone, B. I. c. 6.

Now, my Lords, permit me to observe that this Oath is expressly declared, by this unanswerable authority on British Law, to be, in the first place, "A FUNDAMENTAL AND ORIGINAL EXPRESS CONTRACT;" in the next place, that while the principal articles of it are as ancient as the British Constitution—yet, "*because (as the statute alleges) the Oath had been framed in doubtful words and expressions, with relation to ancient Laws and Constitutions, at this time unknown*"—for this very reason, "*the wording of it was changed at the time of the Revolution.*" Why was it changed, my Lords? Blackstone says, "*to reduce this contract to a plain certainty*"—yet what is the certainty, my Lords, to which the Noble Premier reduces it? It is this—that, though above one thousand of as upright and able Divines, and as pious faithful men as ever lived in the Church of England and Ireland, with thirteen or fourteen Bishops at their head, have, in separate places, and with different views, all concurred in pronouncing this measure a positive breach of that Oath, in their most deliberate and solemn judgment; yet his Lordship can tell them, they are all either such a set of knaves that they pervert, or such a pack of blockheads they are not able to understand, plain English; and that without the least infringement of that obligation, the King may give his Royal Assent to a Bill brought in by the Prime Minister to annihilate half their Episcopacy—confiscate half their Sees—nearly to supersede, by a lay commission, the authority of the Bishops he chuses to leave them—and trample, at his good will and pleasure, on the discipline, the government, and the whole Established Church of Ireland!!!

Now, my Lords, it is for your Lordships' grave and solemn judgment to pronounce where these blockheads and knaves are to be found—whether in the Parliament of England in 1688, who went to the trouble of altering the Oath, because as *their Statute alleges*, it was "*framed in doubtful expressions;*" and changed

the wording of it, as Blackstone affirms, "*to reduce this contract to a plain certainty*"—or among the Bishops and Clergy of Ireland in 1833, who, with this "*plain certainty*" before their eyes, are either so weak or so wicked as to be unable or unwilling to comprehend it.

What now, my Lords, are the words of this Oath?

"THE ARCHBISHOP OR BISHOP SHALL SAY—

"Will you solemnly promise and swear to govern the people of this Kingdom of England and the dominions thereunto belonging, according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the Laws and Customs of the same? THE KING OR QUEEN SHALL SAY.—I solemnly promise so to do."

I believe, my Lords, it will be admitted, that the Statutes, Laws and Customs which had been agreed on in Parliament, and were then in force at the time the oath was taken, are included in this clause, and that therefore all the trusts vested in the King, by the existing Laws were here solemnly sworn to be maintained,

"ARCHBISHOP OR BISHOP—Will you to your power cause Law and Justice in mercy to be executed in all your judgments? KING OR QUEEN.—I will.

"ARCHBISHOP OR BISHOP—Will you to the utmost of your power maintain the Laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion Established by the Law? And will you preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this Realm, and to the Churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges as by Law do or shall appertain to them, or any of them? KING OR QUEEN—All this I promise to do."

"After this, the King or Queen, laying his or her hand upon the Holy Gospels, shall say, 'THE THINGS WHICH I HAVE HERE BEFORE PROMISED, I WILL PERFORM AND KEEP, SO HELP ME GOD, and then shall kiss the book.'

Now, before I enter on the examination of this Oath, I shall take the principles, on which all the weight of the Prime Minister's defence for its violation rests, and see what force they con-

tain,—these principles are two.—For as to the attempt to identify this confiscation, with the Union of Bishopricks that has been made on other occasions, when the Sees were united, because they were considered too small separately to support the dignity of a Bishop, where not a shilling was alienated, and where the union was made to aggrandize the Church, and not as here to impoverish and confiscate her property, the argument is really so monstrous, that it were an insult to your Lordships to anticipate or refute it.

First, then, my Lords, there is an argument from the alleged inconvenience, or absurdity, of supposing that the Coronation Oath precludes any possible change, or as it is called, improvement in the Established Religion. “If, it is said, the King is so tied up “by his Coronation Oath, that no change can be made in the “Church, then all errors, all abuses, all evils, which may creep “in by time, however monstrous, must be immutable; no change “of circumstances in the Nation will admit of any corresponding “adaptation in the Established Religion; and thus the very Institution, which ought to be the best and purest, may become “by sanctified intangible prescription, the most corrupt, and the “most indurated in corruption, in the Country.” This is one of the most specious arguments for this Bill.

It is surely unnecessary to point out to your Lordships the hollow sophistry of an argument which asserts, that if one measure for the spoliation of the Church were a violation of the Coronation Oath, therefore, every measure for its improvement under other circumstances, must be so! The Coronation Oath preserves and protects the Established Church, indeed, from any invasion or subversion, such as this Bill prepares—but it by no means deprives it of the privilege, inseparable from any just and well regulated Institution, of reformation or improvement or even necessary change. The King possesses, as he ought to possess, a just authority, influence, and power, to produce whatever amelioration might be salutary and important to the Nation; and by the advice, and with the consent of his Bishops and Clergy, in Convocation assembled, with the strictest adherence to the Letter and Spirit of his Coronation Oath, he could effect a change as great, though of a different nature, from that which this Bill would

threaten; and this on the just principle of law. "*Volenti not fit injuria.*"

And to shew that I, in common with all the Clergy of Ireland, am no advocate for abuses—no enemy to just, or salutary, or even judicious, or conciliating improvement—though I know the principle of conceding the parish cess is a false one, and that it could not benefit the poor Roman Catholics, yet, because I think the recurrence of parochial annual assessments is made a subject of irritation, and is in itself, a bad mode for levying a tax for a religious use; I would gladly concede it for the spiritual benefit of our Church, and to remove even a seeming ground of complaint, from Roman Catholics. And so thoroughly unfounded is this sophistical argument, my Lords, that I would undertake; though no Statesman, if the Prime Minister were really sincere in any desire to benefit the Church—if he were really sincere in any desire to reform the abuses and promote the spiritual welfare of the Established Religion—if he really wished to remove all just ground of complaint—if he were to give to the Church but one just, one equitable concession, I would undertake, beginning with the See of Waterford, without infringing the Coronation Oath, without injuring one single vested or future interest of the Church—without disturbing a single See; to abolish Vestry Cess—to provide a better fund than this iniquitous Bill provides for all the purposes it specifies—and to remedy abuses, which it only aggravates. I would undertake that your Lordships should hear no more of over-paid, or lazy Bishops, of idle pluralists, or sinecurists, or starving curates, and this not only without the opposition, but, I believe, with the joyful acclamation of every Clergyman in Ireland—I say this, my Lords, both because the Irish Clergy would rejoice to rectify not only every real abuse, but even every seeming cause of complaint against our Church, and because I wish to shew how hollow this principle of defence is, and what wretched sophistry it is to argue, that if such a measure as this is a violation of the Coronation Oath, that therefore, every improvement, or reformation of abuses in the Church must be so too.

The next only ground of defence, and that on which most reliance is placed, is this—

"The King," it is said, "is bound by his Coronation Oath, to preserve to the Bishops and Clergy, such rights as appertain to them *by Law*; but the King takes this Oath in his *Executive* and not in his *Legislative capacity*, and if the Parliament chooses to alter the Law, the King, as Legislator, may assent, without violating his Oath—and then the Law which disposes of the rights of these Bishops and Clergy being changed, the King observes his Oath by carrying that Law into effect, and preserves to the Bishops and Clergy, all such rights and privileges as do by Law appertain unto them!" This is the ablest argument, my Lords, that is adduced to support this bill.

And let me humbly entreat your Lordships to examine the principles which it involves. The Coronation Oath consists of three distinct answers to three specific questions—

THE FIRST—embraces the *Legislative* liberty of the Monarch, in which he swears "*to govern the people according to the Statutes in Parliament agreed on, and the laws and customs of the same.*" Here, my Lords, as the King must be a party to those laws, is embraced every point that can become a subject of Parliamentary enactment—every question that can originate in either House of Parliament, is here laid open to the King in his Legislative capacity, and he is bound, reserving his constitutional discretionary power of the Royal Assent, to govern according to the enactments of Parliament that shall be agreed on.

THE SECOND part of the Oath binds the Monarch to the duties of his *Executive authority*—binds him to administer and execute in justice and mercy those Laws, according to which he has just sworn to govern.

THE THIRD part of the Oath, my Lords, binds the King to a specific individual trust—a trust delegated to him on the authority of that God "*by whom Kings reign, and Princes decree justice*"—a trust vested in his Royal Person, in that office in which he is called the Head of the Church—a trust which this Oath binds him personally to administer and to preserve—a trust which neither your Lordships, nor the House of Commons can lift even a finger to violate, unless the King shall first abandon it into your hands.

This, my Lords, is indisputably clear from every legal proof which has been advanced upon the subject, and this, my Lords, is equally clear, not merely from the plain construction of the Oath, but from the very words of this Bill, and the confession of the noble Premier himself, as shall be proved. And, my Lords, if it be indisputably established, that the Sovereign is bound in his conscience by one clause of the Oath, to the preservation of a clear specifically vested trust—what sort of an argument is it that there is a reservation in another clause for the abandonment of that trust? Who, my Lords, but a Jesuit could urge, or who but a Jesuit could adopt such a principle? Who that had any rectitude of conscience himself, could attempt by any sophistry to reconcile it to the conscience of his Sovereign? Who could assert that the conscience of the Monarch was bound to his God to preserve the sacred interests of his Religion, and at liberty to abandon those interests to the policy of a Prime Minister who might chuse to invade them?

But, my Lords, the noble Premier does not attempt to deny, as who indeed could deny, that this sacred trust is vested in the Crown, and let me entreat your Lordships to consider the argument which he puts forward on this admission—"this Oath binds the King to the Law, so long as the Law lasts; but if the Legislature, of which the King is a part, reverse the Law, the King is then released from his obligation." This is his best, his strongest hold. He cannot deny, that the Law, as it stands, vests the Episcopal Sees in the King, not as owner, but as Guardian and Trustee. The King then, my Lords, swearing to preserve their rights to the Bishops, swears, on the Premier's own showing, to maintain the trust vested in him by the Law, and if the Sovereign abandons his trust before the Law is altered, by the Minister's own concession, he violates his Oath. He is tied and bound by the Law and by his Oath to the Law and the Trust, until the Law is reversed. Now, my Lords, the policy of the Minister, is not the Law—nor his counsel, nor that of all his Cabinet, is not the Law—but when a Bill has passed the two houses of Parliament, and received the Royal assent, then; when that Royal assent is given, that Bill is become Law; and till

this process is completed, to create a new Law, the King, on the Minister's own argument, is bound by his Oath, to maintain the existing Law, that is, the Trust of these Bishopricks, which the Law has vested in him.

But, now, my Lords, mark the dilemma, in which this has placed the Premier—he wants to get at these Bishopricks, to confiscate them for Parish Cess—but these Bishopricks are vested in the King—the King is sworn to keep them by the Law, he cannot, therefore, abandon his Trust, till the Law is changed; and how is the Minister to get them into his power, to make them the subject of a legal enactment? For, by his own confession, they are not in his power, being now in the King's custody. What, my Lords, does the Prime Minister do? how does he attempt to extricate himself from this inextricable difficulty? Having confessed, that his Royal Master is bound by his Oath, to preserve his sacred Trust, until the Law is changed, he sends down the Chancellor of the Exchequer, with a Bill to the House of Commons, in which he asserts that his Sovereign, *has, in the first instance, abandoned his Trust, in order to enable him to pass the Law!* Behold, my Lords, the words of this Bill?—

“Whereas, his Majesty, has been graciously pleased to signify, that he has placed at the disposal of Parliament, his interest in the temporalities, and custody thereof, of the several Bishopricks, and Archbishopricks, mentioned in this Act.”

The Noble Premier attempts, my Lords, to vindicate his counsel, to his Sovereign, by asserting, that he is bound by his Oath, to the Law, that is, to his Trust, till the Law is reversed—and then he presumes to represent, in the body of his Bill, that his Sovereign has actually abandoned his Trust, not only before the Law is reversed—but even before he could make a motion on the subject of reversing the Law!!!

How, now, let me ask, my Lords, does the King dispose of Bishopricks? is it in his Executive or in his Legislative capacity? Certainly in his Executive. But, saith the Noble Premier, he is sworn only in his Executive and free in his Legislative capacity. Grant that this Jesuitical quibble, with which he would attempt to vindicate his counsel, were even true or just; its truth and jus-



tice would fall upon his own head: for, while his Lordship acknowledges the obligation of the Oath to guard the trust, in one sense; he represents his Sovereign, in that very sense, as having violated the obligation—he represents his Gracious Master, in a Bill of Parliament, as having broken his trust in the capacity of the Executive authority, to put it into the Minister's power to make him renounce that trust in the Legislative! His argument is, that a certain legal process alone is previously necessary, to enable the King to do what he, the Minister, wishes, without a crime; and then he represents his Royal Master as having been, in the first instance, guilty of the crime, to put it in the Minister's power to bring about this legal process!! Is this, my Lords, fidelity to a Sovereign? Is this regard for his Honor? Is this veneration for his sacred Person? Is this respect for his Religion? Is this any sense of the solemnity of an Oath—of the most sacred obligations that can bind man to his fellow-creature—that can bind a Monarch to his subjects, his country, or his God? Who is there, my Lords, who would not shrink instinctively, not less for his friend, than for himself, from a suspicion that even the levity of the world could attach, not to his Oath, but to his Honor? And O, my Lords, is it the part of a Peer of Britain, for any scheme of policy, to counsel his Royal Master to an act, which the gravest men in his dominions have pronounced in their conscience and judgment, to be a violation not of his Honor, but his Oath?

How long, my Lords, are the sacred principles of truth, of virtue, and of religion, to be sacrificed upon the altar of base political expediency? How long is position after position to be abandoned to the enemies of order, of justice, and of Christianity, while there are none to arise to defend them? When, my Lords, when is a stand to be made? Is it when nothing worth maintaining has been left? When is there to be a rally for the friends of virtue? Is it when all is lost, and when they are scattered in despair? Have all the standard bearers of the nation fainted, that there is none to lift up an ensign for the rescue; no, not even when the altars of our God are to be trampled to the very earth?

O! my Lords, there was a time, when the thunder of a Chatham's

electric Eloquence could waken into life the very Pictures of your Lordship's Ancestors, the Pillars, the Guardians of their Country's dignity and honor, and summon them to stand out, frowning from the tapestry, that hangs around those venerable walls, and awe into the silence of abashed and conscious guilt, the man who would dare to trample on the rights of Justice and Religion, even in relation to a foreign clime. Now, alas! my Lords, they are all to be trodden under foot, within our own, and shall none stand up within those walls, to rear them even from the very dust? Shall none arise like him to "pass even on the very crime of sacrilege itself, the righteous sentence of just, and holy, and decisive indignation? Shall there be none to call upon the Judges, to "interpose the purity of their Ermine?" None to invoke the Bishops, to "interpose the sanctity of their Lawn?" When the interests of the Religion of Christ, are to be surrendered to a base, and antichristian Superstition—when those who ought to be its sacred Guardians, can betray the conscience of the King—and men can be found to take counsel with the Ministers of that Superstition to mutilate and suppress the Word of their God!!!

Does the Noble Premier suppose, my Lords, that because, of all the classes of his Subjects, that surround the British Throne, the Ministers of the Established Church, have been ever most conspicuous for loyalty and devotion, to the Person, and Government of their King; that he shall find a shelter beneath the canopy of the Throne, in daring to counsel a violation of the Coronation Oath—as if we should be afraid, from motives of delicacy to our Sovereign, to expose, and to denounce the crime.—No! the very principle, my Lords, of loyalty, and of devoted attachment to our King, the sense of dutiful respect—of religious anxiety for the eternal interests of our gracious Monarch, is that which ought to draw forth our loud protest, as Ministers of God, against the man, who would attempt to counsel, and lead the Royal conscience into such a crime as this.

The Noble Premier, my Lords, may view this Oath as but a State concern, which Policy may dictate, and with which Policy may dispense. We view it, my Lords, as a sacred obligation to the living God, commensurate with the existence

and the throne of him who made it. We know and feel the full importance of that admirable maxim of our Constitution, that "*the King can do no wrong*," and we hail the wise and salutary principle which places, by this delicate and useful fiction, the Highest Authority in the realm, as he is, beyond the responsibility, so above even the imputation, of any error; and makes the Minister, the agent who is amenable and accountable to the Nation. Therefore, my Lords, it is the duty of every loyal subject, and above all, of every Minister of God's Eternal Truth, who would not be an accessary before the fact, to lift his loud protest against that crime, of which, in the eyes of the Nation, the sole responsibility devolves not upon our Gracious Sovereign but upon the Minister.

But, my Lords, while we most willingly enter into the spirit of the principle that "*the King can do no wrong*," as a maxim of the British Constitution; we do not forget that our Royal Master is the servant of a King who knows of no such fiction, in reference to any sinner, though he were seated on a Throne—a King, from whose judgment neither the policy of the Cabinet, nor the power of the Crown, can afford any plea or any protection, to the Minister or to the Monarch. And therefore, while we would most humbly but most faithfully, both warn and exhort our Gracious Sovereign, not in reference to ourselves, to whom he is not accountable—but in reference to that God to whom he is—we feel the more loudly called on to expose and to denounce that man, who would attempt so criminally to mislead the Royal conscience. O, my Lords, is it because, in the present fervour and rage of superstition, infidelity, and democratic fury against the Established Church, a Minister may hope to escape not only with impunity, but with applause, and to drown the voice of Justice, of Truth, and of Religion, in the shouts of a radical, an infidel and popish mob; is it, therefore, my Lords, he is to counsel his Sovereign, to sacrifice that which is dearer to him than his life, his honor, or his crown—that he is to make the solemnities of the next world subservient to the purposes of power and popularity in this—and throw, without remorse, the tremendous responsibility upon that sacred and anointed Head, before the bar of Him, from

whose tribunal there is no retreat, and from whose sentence there is no appeal.

And now, my Lords, that the real nature of this measure, may come more clearly, and conclusively before your Lordships' judgment, I shall defer for a moment, the consideration of the question in reference to his most Gracious Majesty, till I make an application of the Golden Rule, to the case, that shall bring, I trust, a sense of contrition to the breast of that noble Lord on whom the weight must fall, and carry home conviction to the conscience, and the understanding not only of that Most August Assembly, whom I have the honor to address, but to that of every fair and honest man, that shall see and feel the truth, and power of the application.

I will suppose, my Lords, that the Law of England had vested in the Prime Minister, for the time being, the whole of that Ecclesiastical Patronage, Responsibility and Trust, which it has vested in the person of the Monarch—I will suppose, that he had the Custody and Guardianship, of the Bishopricks, and Temporalities of the Church, and that immediately on his entrance upon the duties of his office, he was obliged to take, among the Peers, in the House of Lords, the Oath which the King takes, at his Coronation. Now, that we may bring the Act and Oath, into direct comparison and contrast, I will suppose, my Lords, that on the very Night the Prime Minister were to take this Oath, on that same Night he were to bring forward this Bill.

His Lordship shall state his own case, without sophistry or circumlocution, and then, my Lords, see how it stands.

#### PRIME MINISTER SWEARS—

*"I will to the utmost of my power maintain the laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant reformed Religion established by the law—So help me God."*

#### PRIME MINISTER LEGISLATES—

*"I bring in a bill, My Lords, entitled—A BILL TO ALTER AND AMEND THE LAWS RELATING TO THE TEMPORALITIES OF THE CHURCH OF*

"IRELAND, which is expedient to conciliate the members of the  
 "Church of Rome, a church so far from 'the true profession of  
 "the Gospel,' that we have often sworn it to be 'Idolatrous and  
 "Superstitious'—this bill is to qualify and counterbalance another,  
 "which is necessary to suppress Popish plunder and assassination  
 "of the Protestant Clergy, and Popish resistance to the laws in  
 "Ireland; and this bill shall so affect 'the Protestant reformed  
 "Religion' in that country, that the Popish members of the House  
 "of Commons shall hail its announcement with joyous shouts  
 "of acclamation."

#### PRIME MINISTER SWEARS—

"I will preserve unto the Bishops and Clergy of this realm  
 "and to the Churches committed to their charge, all such rights  
 "and privileges as by law do or shall appertain to them or any of  
 "them, all this I promise to do. After this the Prime Minister  
 "laying his hand upon the Holy Gospels shall say, 'The things  
 "which I have here before promised I will perform and keep—So  
 "help me God,' and then shall kiss the book.

#### PRIME MINISTER LEGISLATES—

"I bring in a bill my Lords, to abolish the offices of ten of the  
 "Bishops of the Established Church, to alienate their Sees,  
 "to sell for ever their residences, and to vest the produce in  
 "Commissioners to pay parish cess and for other purposes. I  
 "shall raise money, besides, upon the sale in perpetuity of their  
 "leases, which I shall devote to the uses of the state; or perhaps  
 "to pay the Popish Priests; I shall lower the revenues, and lay a  
 "graduated tax on the few Bishops that remain, and on all the  
 "Clergy of Ireland without their concurrence or consent."

"I shall appoint a Commission chiefly of laymen who shall  
 "supersede Episcopal jurisdiction over all the Unions in Ireland,  
 "amounting to half the parishes. I shall give these Unions into  
 "their hands to dissolve them, and to suspend the presentation  
 "of the Clergy to all the parishes of these Unions on which no  
 "Churches are built, and where there has been no service for the  
 "three last years; and I will allow no Churches to be built when

"the Protestants are too few or too poor to subscribe a sum sufficient to ensure a good Protestant congregation in the Church."

"And since my Lords, the Law has vested in my custody and trust the rights and privileges of the Bishops mentioned in my oath, so that your Lordships cannot touch them or deal with them as the Law stands, till I give up my trust, I hereby signify that I abandon and give up that trust to your Lordships—I place at the disposal of Parliament, my interest in the temporalities and custody thereof, of all the Archbishopricks and Bishopricks which I intend by this bill to confiscate in the Church of Ireland."

There, my Lords, is the Prime Minister's Oath !!!

Here, my Lords, is the Prime Minister's Bill ! ! ! ! !

Necessary as it is to exhibit the conduct of the Noble Premier in the light that it deserves before the Nation, still respect for his Lordship's feelings as a man, and profound respect for your Lordship's August Assembly, constrains me to plead the melancholy necessity which that conduct to my Religion and my Country, has imposed, for exhibiting a member of your Lordship's Right Honorable House, even in imagination, in such an attitude before you, that it is impossible to determine whether it most betrays a prostration of all intellect, or an abandonment of all principle. And, if I, my Lords, am constrained by ordinary feelings of humanity for the Noble Premier, and respect for your Lordships, to apologise for placing him in this position, even in fancy, before the Nation, oh ! how, my Lords, shall he apologise—how enter into the Royal presence—how lift his eyes to meet, not the man—not the equal—not the friend—but, the Sovereign ! whom, when he has confided his Government, his Dignity, his Honor, to his care, he would ensnare, by his counsels, into that actual condition before his Country, and his God :—from which, when he beholds himself in it, even in the mirror of imagination, he recoils, and justly recoils from the image, with horror and disgust ?

Permit me, my Lords, to waive all technicalities of legal disquisitions and distinctions—to leave to the noble Premier all the latitude of freedom in his *Legislative Conscience*, and obligation

in his *Executive Conscience*, on which he attempts to vindicate this Bill—let me give him all the advantages of every plea, that all the Jesuits in Rome, and all the Statesmen in the Cabinet can make, and on the plain, honest principles of British Justice, and of Holy Truth, allow me, my Lords, to lay the Bible and Blackstone before him, on the table of your Lordship's Right Honorable House, and to ask him, one single question.

Would he venture to stand before the Peers of England, and to use the sanction, with which your Lordship's august Assembly ratifies its declarations—would he, my Lords, with this trust vested in himself, as it is vested in his Sovereign, look your Lordships and the British Empire in the face, and lay his hand upon his breast and say,—

*"Upon my honor, I would take that Oath,"*

And, *"Upon my honor, I would give up my Trust, and bring in, or pass that Bill."*

If he would not dare to do so, my Lords, if his Lordship must confess that no man of understanding, or of conscience, could dare to give utterance to an assertion, such as this,—then how, my Lords, can any man venture to counsel to his Royal Master—how attempt, by any sophistry, to reconcile to the conscience, and understanding of his Sovereign, what he must confess before your Lordships and the British Empire to be irreconcilable and repugnant to his own?

How can he presume to call upon your Lordships—to call upon the Peers of England, upon the Judges, and the Bishops of the land, to send up to their Sovereign a Bill, which, whether considered in reference to themselves, or to their Monarch, involves in it a principle, alike abhorrent from every similitude of Truth, of Law, of Justice, and of Religion?

If your Lordships were to see the Noble Premier about to fall into such an offence himself, as thus to take, and thus to violate an oath. Is there my Lords, a friend—is there even an opponent of the Noble Earl in all your Right Honorable House, who would not strain every power, who would not exert every energy to rescue him from falling into such irreparable ruin?—and

O my Lords, if that Noble Earl is so blinded and misled by a perverse and fatal policy, as to do worse than commit this act himself, by urging it through a tissue of delusive and destructive sophistry upon the conscience of his Royal Master—where my Lords is the Sovereign to hope for refuge and redress, if the Peers of his realm, the pillars and guardians of his Royal throne, do not rally round his Sacred Person at a crisis such as this? Would your Lordships form a phalanx around your Monarch, and sacrifice your own lives to rescue him from death, and will you my Lords desert him, when a base and antichristian policy would endeavour to involve his Royal conscience in that to which a thousand deaths were preferable? Yea, my Lords, when that very same policy would seek to impose upon your Lordships, and make your Lordships the abettors and accessaries to the crime, by attempting to palm such a bill as this upon your consciences and understanding.

But my Lords, when your Lordships shall individually consider the case as applied personally to yourselves—when your Lordships each, shall ask the question of his own breast; “If that trust were vested in me; could I undertake that trust?—could I take that oath to maintain it?—and could I consent for any human power to abandon it?”—if then, my Lords, if there is not a Peer within the British Realms, who would not shudder to commit the crime—if even the Noble Premier himself must recoil from the act when brought home to him plainly and faithfully as has been done—if common sense and principle, not to speak of duty to a Sovereign, forbid that a man should counsel his Monarch, to an act, from which he would revolt himself—if there is not a Judge in the Land, who will deny, that the Law has vested the Trust as I have stated it, in the Crown—and if it does not need a Bishop to assert, that an Oath upon the Bible, to maintain a Trust, must bind the Man, who takes that Oath, to its observance—then I say, my Lords, while the Record of this nefarious Bill, shall remain upon the page of British History—while facts shall find a place, within the Annals of your Country—while Perjury, shall be called a crime,



and Truth, a virtue—while Blackstone, shall be a Standard of the Law, and the Bible, the authority of the Christian Faith, of Britain—so long shall the Noble Premier stand, convicted, before the Principle—the Truth—the Justice—and the Religion of the Nation.

1st. Of a Profane, Unconstitutional attempt to subvert by this bill the Established Church of Ireland.—

2d. Of counselling a direct act of Perjury to the Crown, in advising his Royal Master to violate the solemn compact, ratified with his People, in his Coronation Oath.—

3d. Of having even had the temerity, to represent our Gracious Sovereign, as doing the act, to which he presumes to counsel him, as if he were thus endeavouring to gain his end, and screen himself, in the attempt, to implicate by anticipation even the Sacred Person of our Monarch.

And, my Lords, while the Church can, both by the Usage, and the Law of England, and by every principle of Equity and Justice, improve, amend, and reform any abuses, (and she has several, that need to be reformed,) and while she can, with her King at her head, by her Bishops, and Clergy in convocation, lawfully assembled, tax her Livings, or her Bishopricks, to any given amount, and have her acts ratified into Law, by Parliament. I affirm, humbly, but most confidently, my Lords, though addressing the most enlightened body of Statesmen in the world—I affirm in the presence of every Lawyer, in Westminster Hall, that, thanks to the great and venerable wisdom, of our Ancestors—thanks to the admirable structure of the British Constitution, in a part, which as yet the Minister has been unable to overturn—thanks to the Convention, of 1688, which reduced the King's contract to "*a plain certainty*," and made that contract, the Coronation Oath—thanks, above all, to the overruling, and protecting power, and providence, of our God; the Church is so secured, by the Statute Law of England, and the Coronation Oath of the King—that such a spoliation never can be perpetrated to subserve any criminal policy, or to please any Infidel or Popish Mob—unless, an act of unpa-

rallied, political profligacy in a Minister, should succeed, in forcing an act of tremendous perjury, upon the Crown.

And now, my Lords, I have done. The Church of Ireland demands a discharge of duty, in another quarter. It is of no consequence to your Lordships who the writer of these pages is.

Whatever principles of truth, of justice, and of religion, are contained within them, let me humbly entreat your Lordships to ascribe them in common to the body of the Irish Clergy, than whom there does not exist a body of Ministers more unworthy to be made a subject of insult and contempt, such as this Bill, so dishonorable to its projectors, would offer to them.

Whatever evils or errors your Lordships' wisdom may discover in this address, and no doubt they must be many, permit me to assure your Lordships that they are to be ascribed solely to the writer; but if there be any inconsistent with that profound respect which is due to your Lordships' dignity, and still more with that dutiful reverence that is due to our Gracious Sovereign, permit me to assure your Lordships, that they have arisen from inadvertence, in treating of a subject, perhaps the most difficult and delicate that could be written on in such circumstances, and, therefore, I humbly entreat your Lordships will forgive them.

But, my Lords, with the most profound and dutiful respect for all the constituted authorities and dignities of this world, I cannot forget that there is an authority, a dignity, that, in one sense, is higher than them all—and it is that of him, who, holding up his Master's Sacred Truth, as a servant of the King of kings and Lord of lords, calls upon his fellow-men, whatever be their rank, to discharge their duty in that sphere, in which their God has placed them; and therefore, my Lords, as a Minister of the God of Heaven and Earth, whether I consider this Bill in reference to the conscience of our Gracious Sovereign—or to the evils which it must accumulate on this land, already overwhelmed with guilt and superstition, or in reference to that true and holy Religion of our Established Church, which it necessarily weakens and lays open to the inroads of infidel idolatry. I can say, my Lords,

that in calling on your Lordships in the name of God to cast out this Bill with a righteous indignation, from your House, I am fulfilling the duties of my own conscience, and calling on your Lordship to discharge, as legislators, your most solemn and most imperative duty to your King, your Country, and your God.

I have the honor to be,

My Lords,

With profound and respectful submission,

Your Lordships' most faithful

And most obedient

Humble Servant,

A MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.



A

PLAIN, SOLEMN, AND FAITHFUL

# APPEAL

TO THE

MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

HIS GRACE THE

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

---

“Moreover, it is required in Stewards, that a man be found faithful.”—1 Cor. 4. 2.

---

LONDON:  
HATCHARD AND SON, PICCADILLY,  
R. M. TIMS, GRAFTON-STREET, DUBLIN.

1833.



## A PLAIN SOLEMN AND FAITHFUL APPEAL, &c. &c.

---

MY LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

The present awful crisis of our Church, and our Country, will plead the apology of any Minister of our Communion, for approaching your Grace. Permit me then, my Lord, to come with all that reverence, that is due to your Grace's exalted rank, and with all that personal respect, that is due to your Grace's character.

I should grieve, my Lord, to be constrained to make this appeal to your Grace, as an Umpire in this disastrous cause ; did I not believe, that the consciousness of performing your sacred duty, would, even in the most painful, and trying circumstances, counterbalance all the difficulties that might embarrass its discharge ; and that your Grace would ever be ready, with all the efforts of your understanding, and all the feelings of your heart, with all the dignity of your office, and all the powers, with which that dignity invests you, to respond to an appeal, made in that behalf, which is the subject of your Grace's constant prayer, "the advancement of God's glory, the good of his Church, the honor of his Sacred Majesty, and the safety and welfare of his Kingdom."

Your Grace is placed, by the Permission, and Providence of God, in the most exalted station in that Church, whose holy and

venerable principles are "*built on the foundation of the Apostles, and Prophets—Jesus Christ himself, being the chief corner stone*;"—and I trust, my Lord, you are placed there to manifest, at this eventful crisis, the spiritual wisdom of our Ancestors, who have given to the highest Officer in the Church, the precedence of all the dignities, but that of Royalty in the state, and placed him to follow the next, and nearest, in the train of the King, and Father of his People. Yes, my Lord, when Religion rises up in all the native majesty of Truth, to vindicate the honor of insulted Virtue, and abash the hardened front of Vice.—When, "*reasoning of righteousness, temperance and judgment to come*," she can make the Heathen Legislator, to tremble, even on his seat of office—when looking up to Heaven, with the Psalmist, she can say, "*I will speak of thy testimonies, even before Kings, and will not be ashamed*;"—then, my Lord, it is the noblest sight that ever blessed a Nation's eyes, to see her "*rear her mitred head in Senates*;"—holding up the Word of Life, as a light unto her Monarch's feet—lifting it on high, as a Beacon to the People, she appears at once, the Guardian of their security, in this world, and the Guide of their salvation, in the next. She hallows the authority of Earth, by investing it, with the sanctity of Heaven; and seems like an Angel, placed at the Fountain head, to bless, and purify the streams of Law, of Justice, and of Mercy, like him who descended to impart their virtues to the Waters, and endued them with healing energy, and power, to bless the eager expectant, that waited on their bank.

Never, my Lord, were all the principles of true Religion so called forth, in Britain, as at the present crisis of her fate—never were the Dignitaries of the Church so called on to stand up as the witnesses for their God and the supporters of their King. The axe of infidelity and superstition is laid to the very root of their Church—the Pillars of the British Throne are shaking to their foundation. Never, my Lord, was man, who filled the high and holy office entrusted to your Grace, so called on to plant his foot, before a Nation's eyes, upon the Rock of Ages, and stand, as it is his mighty privilege to stand, in the strength of the Eternal God—unmoved and immoveable before



the world.—May the Almighty Lord of Heaven and Earth pour down His strength and Spirit on your Grace's head, and give you so to stand in this most trying hour—that washed in the precious blood of Him who died for sinners, and covered in the robe of His unspotted righteousness, you may glorify His Holy Name—you may stand a faithful witness of his truth, and lift your head with joy at the coming, and the kingdom, of “the Shepherd and Bishop of souls!!”

I need not, my Lord, recapitulate the evils, and the dangers adverted to, in the address prefixed to this appeal. The meditated crime, not only against our Church, but against the conscience, of our Gracious Sovereign, has been proved—unanswerably proved, to be a direct violation of the Laws of the Realm—Laws, which, relating to a Trust, that is vested in the King, and which the King is bound, by his Coronation Oath to maintain, cannot be called into question by the Minister, without a high offence against the Monarch. The nature, and extent of this offence, it is, my Lord, the object of this appeal, to shew—I bring it and place it at once, in the plainest, clearest light, and in the presence of that Holy Church, over which, your Grace, is appointed to preside—in the presence of the United Empire—in the presence of our much injured Sovereign—and in the presence of the King of kings, the Lord, and Judge of Heaven, and Earth—I appeal to you, my Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, and solemnly adjure you, to pronounce your faithful decision, on the Question which is now proposed.

Let me recal your Grace's recollection to that day when the King, and all the Nobles of his Land, were assembled to hold the solemn ceremony of the Coronation—when your Grace stood forth before the sacred person of the Monarch, and acting in the discharge of that duty which the Law of England has imposed upon your holy office, you stood as the servant of the Most High God, as the witness of the compact that binds the Monarch to his people, to administer the Coronation Oath—when all around, were looking on with reverential awe, and expectation—when this Diadem was borne, by the appointed Ministers of State, to be placed by your Grace's hand, upon that sacred, and anointed

head. Let me now suppose, my Lord, that when your Grace proposed that solemn Question, on which, the maintenance, and protection of the Religion of the Nation, rests secured—

*“Will you, to the utmost of your power, maintain the Laws of God, the true profession of the Gospel, and the Protestant Reformed Religion, Established by the Law? and, will you preserve unto the Bishops, and Clergy of this Realm, and to the Churches committed to their charge, all such rights and privileges, as by Law, do, or shall appertain to them, or any of them?”*

If, I say, my Lord—when your Grace proposed this solemn question, and when the King had answered in the prescribed form *“All this I promise to do”*—his Majesty had added, *“But my Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, I shall consent to the Prime Minister to cut off ten Bishops—to confiscate their sees to pay parish cess—to appoint a Commission which shall supersede Episcopal authority over the Clergy, by dissolving their Unions, and shall suspend presentation of Clergymen over certain districts of the land, with various other measures which may hereafter be deemed expedient to please my Roman Catholic subjects”*—If, I say, my Lord, the King had thus expressed the intention of adopting or consenting to the regulations of this bill, I ask you, my Lord Archbishop, in the presence of that God, in whose name and by whose authority your Grace was administering that solemn Oath,

### WOULD YOU, OR COULD YOU HAVE PLACED THE CROWN UPON YOUR MONARCH'S HEAD?

I need not anticipate the answer of a Christian Prelate, that *“You would have sooner laid your own upon the block.”*

What, my Lord, would you have done? What powers of a Painter could do justice to such a scene? You would have raised your eyes to Heaven for strength, which Heaven alone could have given to human heart at such a moment—You would have bent them down with holy grief and pity on your Monarch;—and while the Bible trembled in your convulsed and palsied hand, you would have turned to look upon the Nobles that stood around—and read in all their amazed and agitated countenances, and seen on

all their quivering lips, a sad assent to the sentence that would have faltered from your tongue, that "*the solemn ceremony must be stopped, for that none could think these words proceeded from a Being accountable or responsible either to God or Man!!!*"—

O my Lord Archbishop, pardon, I beseech your Grace, that I have dared, even in imagination, to suppose such words to proceed from the Sacred lips of our most Gracious Sovereign; pardon, my Lord, that compelled by sad necessity, I have dared even to imagine a scene the very thought of which must inflict a bitter pang upon your Grace's heart.

But, my Lord, if every feeling of respect and loyalty, and honor for our Gracious Monarch, bids me lay my head in the dust and apologize for attributing, even in imagination, the bare expression of such an intention to the Royal mind; then, Who or What is he my Lord, that dares—not to imagine the intention, but to counsel to his Sovereign the very act itself?—Who, or What is he my Lord, who, when in virtue of that Solemn Oath, the Crown was placed upon his Sovereign's head—dares in the face of a nation that bears the name of Christian, to counsel such a violation of that Oath; that you my Lord, are witness between the Nation and the King, and between both and Heaven, that the bare expressed intention of such an act, had suspended to this hour the diadem, even when it hung over the Monarch's brow?

If I must humbly apologize to your Grace, for inflicting on your mind the pang of placing, even in imagination, your Royal Master before you in the attitude even of expressing an intention so at variance with the Oath you were administering—then, Who, or What is he my Lord, that dares to come into your Most Reverend Presence, and confesses that he counsels not the intention, but the very act itself to his Sovereign—who presumes to call on you my Lord, to call on your Most Reverend, and Right Reverend Brethren, to call on the Noble and learned Judges of the land, and to call on all the Peers of England, not only to suffer, but to be accessaries in the crime—to join him in the attempt—to deceive—to blind the understanding and conscience of their Sovereign, and to make that deed a part and parcel of the law of England, which would entail dishonor and guilt upon her Crown—disgrace, eternal disgrace, upon

her History—which would shake to their very foundation the pillars of her Throne—and subvert the very existence of her holy and Established Religion !

O ! my Lord Archbishop, on what gloomy days we are fallen ! when England's Morals, and England's Religion, and England's Truth, and Virtue, and Honor, are so low, that they held out the prospect of impunity, to him, who can insult them with an act like this !

The infidel historian, Gibbon, speaking of the Religious Sentiments, even of the Pagans, says :—

“ They knew, and valued the advantages of Religion, as it is connected with civil Government ;” “ and they respected, as the firmest bond of society, the useful persuasion that either in this or in a future life, the crime of perjury is most assuredly, punished by the avenging gods.” And the Heathen Poet himself has represented the contempt of oaths as foremost among the most awful proofs of national abandonment and degradation, in Pagan Rome, during the accelerating progress of her final ruin. But amidst all the examples of crime that he has set before us, he does not produce the instance of a man who sought to incorporate an act of perjury among the laws of his unhappy country.

But, my Lord, if such a Bill as this should pass the Parliament of England, Pagan Rome and Pagan gods shall rise in the judgment, and condemn her at the bar of that God whom she professes to adore.

What bond of civil government or social life—what administration of justice—what dispensation of the laws—what sanctions of religion—what ties of private life—what sanctuary for the human heart—what hope of man on earth can be safe or sacred, were the nation polluted by a crime like this ;—when private Virtue and public Truth—the Religion—the Laws—the Justice—the Government of the Land, were to be all corrupted and poisoned at the very fountain head, and to flow down with dark infection in their streams, through all the extremities of a disgraced, dishonored Nation ?

O ! my Lord Archbishop, this, this is the moment for Religion to arise, and lift her high and holy form in Senates, and in all her native grace and dignity, confident and mighty, in the power

of her God, to stand forth the Vindicator of her own insulted majesty—the Guardian of her Sovereign's honor—the Protector of her Country's Laws.

To you, my Lord Archbishop—to your Grace, I say, who are placed to preside over that Church, whose ruin is portended, and who were the Administrator, and the Witness, between your Country and your God, of that solemn Compact, which is to be violated by this Bill; the Church, the Nation, look at this eventful crisis.

To you, my Lord, they look, to stand up the first, and foremost, in the British Senate, and lift your holy hands, in high and solemn denunciation of a crime, pregnant with ruin to your Country—destruction to your Church—dishonor to your Sovereign, and insult to your God.

To you, my Lord, they look, to go, with dutiful fidelity, to the feet of your most gracious Sovereign, to disabuse the Royal mind of every influence produced by the unworthy sophistry of those who ought to be, not the betrayers, but, the guardians of his conscience and his honor—to compare the provisions of this unprincipled Bill with the clear, explicit words of that most sacred Obligation. And O, my Lord, may the Eternal Spirit endue your Grace with wisdom and strength proportioned to your duty—may your soul be lifted up in the power of the faith of Him who died for sinners, when you yourself shall think, and shall remind your Royal Master, of that great day, when you shall stand together before the King of kings; when all respect of persons shall have passed away, when the Crozier and the Sceptre, the Mitre and the Crown, shall alike be crumbled into dust—and nothing shall remain of all these dignities, but the deep responsibility attached to those who had been here entrusted with such mighty talents. And, O my Lord, when pleading the cause of your Religion, before the Senate, may your Grace be endued with strength and wisdom, from on high, as you temper the power of the Christian Patriot, with the gracious offices of the Christian Prelate; and while with all the fire and dignity of the former, you denounce the crime, O may your Grace be blessed and guided, as you call the criminal to repentance. O may your Grace be strengthened, in the very act of vindicating our venerable

Church from this assault to show what is that truth, that makes her worth defending—that instead of the heartless, hopeless ruin, entailed by Infidelity, on the immortal Spirit—instead of the host of lying refuges for sin, with which the Superstition, to which she would be sacrificed, beguiles the miserable sinner—She holds forth to a lost, and guilty world, the rich, the free, the full salvation of a crucified, and risen Saviour, and gives to man, the only solid pledge of peace and happiness in this world, by bringing before his heart and hope, the only sure salvation in that which is to come.

My Lord Archbishop, if the object of this Bill, were, but to blow a feather to the winds, it were an awful crime, if that feather were to be blown, by the breath of perjury. And this were of itself, enough to call all those, who bear the name of Christian, or even of men of principle, or honor, to oppose it. But be not deceived my Lord—it is not the contemptible question, whether a Minister of state is to be disappointed in the object of his policy, his popularity, or his ambition—nor whether a certain bill is to be thrown out, or to pass the Houses of Parliament—no my Lord, nor even whether the Crown is to be placed upon a British Monarch's brow. But this my Lord, is the question. Whether the Word and Glory of the Holy and Eternal God are to be sacrificed to the carnal policy of a weak and sinful man—whether the immortal souls of thousands and of millions are to be given over and consigned to dark and antichristian superstitions—whether the Beacon of eternal life is, as far as human power can effect it, to be quenched—or lighted, and held up on high for guilty Ireland? Nor does it concern Ireland alone, my Lord—the very existence of the Church of England hangs upon this question: If once the principle is admitted and the precedent established, that not only without the consent but in open and contemptuous defiance of the Bishops and Clergy, the Church is to be made the temporal toy of a Minister and a House of Commons, the breach is made; Infidelity and Superstition may go in and out, and plunder and overturn, as they please—the bulwarks of our holy Church, cemented by the blood of her Martyrs, are broken down—and the work of ruin shall have commenced in a manner

appropriately suited to its consummation—and having begun in the violation of all Christian Truth, shall go on to the utter subversion of the Christian Religion in the Country.

I have the honor to be,

My Lord Archbishop, your Grace's

Most faithful, and most obedient

Humble Servant,

A MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.

*June, 1833.*







